

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 9 are amended, Claim 13 is cancelled and Claim 21 is added. Claims 1-3, 5-11 and 14-21, as amended, remain in the application.

No new matter is added by the amendments to the claims.

In the Office Action dated December 30, 2004, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the U.S. Patent No. 1,563,687 issued to Chaney. The Examiner stated that Moore (should be Chaney) teaches a sheet of sheet stock for forming an item holder comprising: a planar blank portion made of cardboard material. The Examiner stated that planar blank portion including a front portion 1, a rear portion 2 attached to said front portion 1 at a first score line 3, a connector portion 6' attached to said rear portion 2 at a second score line 8, and a holder portion 7 attached to said connector portion 6' at a third score line 9', whereby said front portion 1 and said rear portion 2 can be folded relative to each other along said first score line 3, said rear portion 2 and said connector portion 6' can be folded relative to each other along said second score line 8, and said connector portion 6' and said holder portion 7 can be folded relative to each other along said third score line 9' to form an item holder having a holder pocket (figure 5 and 6) for receiving at least one item. The Examiner also stated that Chaney also teaches a pair of support portions 17, 17' formed in the rear portion 2, wherein each support portion being partially separable from the rear portion 2 at a die cut line 18 and 18'.

The Examiner rejected Claims 3, 5, 9, 10, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the U.S. Patent No. 2,515,887 issued to Moore in view of Chaney. The Examiner stated that Moore teaches a sheet of stock for forming an item holder comprising a planar blank portion including a front portion 24 (47,48), a rear portion 22, 23 attached to said front portion at a first score line 23', a connector portion 21 attached to said rear portion at a second score line 21' and a holder portion 20 attached to said connector portion 21 at a third score line 20', whereby said front portion and said rear portion can be folded relative to each other along said first score line 23', said rear portion and said connector portion can be folded relative to each other along said second score line 21', and said connector portion and said holder portion 7 can be folded relative to each other along said third score line to form an item holder having a holder pocket for receiving at least one item. The Examiner also stated that Moore also teaches a support portion 53 extending from the rear portion. According to the Examiner, it

000132818/0001/617083-1

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to construct the support stand taught by Moore comprising a pair of support portions as taught by Chaney to provide a more sturdy support structure. The Examiner stated with respect to claim 5, Moore teaches a pair of wings 39 and 40 extending from the rear portion.

Claim 1 defines a sheet of stock including a planar carrier portion and a blank portion attached to the carrier portion by at least one die cut line. When the blank portion is detached from the carrier portion, the blank portion can be folded into an item holder. Neither of the cited references shows the claimed carrier portion.

Applicants amended Claim 1 to clarify that the sheet formed by the carrier portion and the blank portion is sized for printing on the blank portion by a printer. Such a sheet of stock is not shown in or suggested by the cited references.

Applicants added dependent Claim 21 to define the extension portion 19.

The Examiner also objected to Claims 6, 7, 8 and 13 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but stated they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants cancelled Claim 13 and amended Claim 9 to include the subject matter of cancelled Claim 13.

The Examiner allowed Claims 15-20.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the above arguments, Applicants believe that the claims of record now define patentable subject matter over the art of record. Accordingly, an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.